

WISCONSIN WORKS (W-2) CONTRACT AND IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE

201 E. Washington Avenue, GEF 1, Room D203
Madison, WI

Friday, January 18, 2002
10:00 AM - 12:30 PM

MINUTES

The W-2 Contract and Implementation Committee is the single point of contact for feedback to the Department of Workforce Development on policy implementation related to W-2 agencies, and includes representation from the Wisconsin County Human Service Association (WCHSA), Urban Caucus counties, W-2 private agencies in Milwaukee County and the balance of state, and Tribal W-2 agencies.

COMMITTEE:

Members (Present = X)

X	Eric Baker	DWS/AO
	William B. Adams	Racine County
	Jon Angeli	Southwest Consortium
	Phyllis A. Bermingham	Marathon County
X	Doris Green	OIC
	Tina Koehn	UMOS
X	Teresa Pierce	Workforce Connections, Inc
	Laverne Plucinski.....	Bad River Chippewa
	Jewel Reichert	Fond du Lac County
X	Adelene Robinson	Kenosha County
X	Shirley Ross.....	La Crosse County
	Liz Green	Dane County
	Jerry Stepaniak.....	MAXIMUS
	Julia Taylor	YW Works
X	Michael Van Dyke.....	Door County

Alternates (Present = X)

	Jan Alft.....	Marathon County
X	Marcia Christiansen.....	Forward Services Corp.
X	Cheryl Cobb.....	UMOS
	Mona Garland.....	OIC
X	Deb Hughes	Southwest Consortium
	Edward Kamin III	Kenosha County
	Richard L. Kammerud	Polk County
X	James Krivsky	Racine County
X	Barbara Metoxen	Oneida Nation
	Tom Miller.....	La Crosse County
	Rita Renner	YW Works
	Chris Schmitz	Fond du Lac County

State Staff Attendees:

Mary Rowin, DWS/AO
Jude Morse, DWS/BPS
Nancy Buckwalter, DWS/BPS
Ron Blascoe, DWS/BWI

Dianne Reynolds, DWS/BWP
Gary Denis, DWS/BWP
Lee Mutchler, DWD/ASD

Guests:

Marilyn Putz, Kaiser/Walworth Co.
Kathi Madsen, Douglas Co. DHS
Sara Shackleton, Dane Co. DHS
Kevin Loef, Goodwill, Kenosha
Neil Naftzger, YWORKS (phone)

Jill Erickson, Milwaukee Co.
Victoria Carreon, Legislative Fiscal Bureau
Erin Fath, DOA/State Budget Office
Karyn Rotker, ACLU/WIF

Recorder: Stephen Dow, DWD/DWS/BWP

Welcome

Eric Baker welcomed everyone to the meeting and noted that Rita Renner was unable to make the meeting but one of her staff, Neil Naftzger, was able to participate by conference call.

Minutes Approval

Motion to accept the minutes was made by Mr. Krivsky with second by Ms. Green. Motion carried.

Issue/Discussion: C&I Committee Revitalization (Eric Baker, Mary Rowin & Jude Morse)

Ms. Hughes, under "Purpose of the W-2 C&I Committee", suggested changing "customer-focused" to "service-focused" or "program-focused" delivery model. Ms. Rowin suggested we leave it as is until the new committee has the opportunity to consider the issue.

Mr. Krivsky asked where the membership would come from for the potential Quarterly Work Programs Advisory Group. Mr. Baker responded that not all of this issue has been resolved and consultation with the Secretary's Office needs to be done first.

Mr. Van Dyke asked if the workgroup that arrived at this proposal reviewed the original 1997 documents that originally set up the Committee. Ms. Morse responded they did and agreed to add some language to the draft on developing Fiscal Impact Statements and recommending Contingency Fund access criteria.

Members agreed a portion needs to be added about fiscal concerns as an issue for with which the Committee will continue its involvement.

Ms. Hughes asked why the co-chair did not include the Administrator's Office staff [the DWS co-chair is the Director of the Bureau of Partner Services (BPS)]. Mr. Baker responded this was done for several reasons:

- The DWS Administrator has just accepted a position in the Secretary's Office, so the position will be vacant.
- This co-chair plan mimics that of the Income Maintenance Advisory Committee (IMAC), which has been operating successfully for several years.
- The direct contact with local agencies and its monitoring role seems more appropriate for BPS than any other DWS bureau.

Mr. Baker noted there was no intention to reduce the importance of the Committee, only to provide a DWS manager with more timely access than the AO may be able to provide, although the Committee should expect the Administrator will continue to attend the majority of its meetings. Mr. Van Dyke commented that the strong presence of the AO in the Committee has always been a positive and something members did not want to see disappear. Mr. Baker noted that, although a prime cause for this "revitalization" was to have members assume a more important, self-initiated level of responsibilities, the AO will not lessen its interests in the Committee. Mr. Van Dyke was concerned that, without the continued participation of the AO, people will go around the Committee directly to the AO; the AO's office has no interest in allowing this to happen and, instead, wants a strong, viable statewide group with which to work. DWS is interested in C&I continuing to be a means of statewide input the AO can rely upon.

Ms. Hughes asked that alternates be continued. Mr. Baker noted DWS has found that alternates frequently become the regular members while the regular members seldom attend. Mr. Krivsky suggested that more realistic member appointments would negate such situations. Mr. Baker suggested, and the members agreed that the alternates issue be the first discussed by the new C&I.

Mr. Baker asked that a Nominating Subcommittee be established and it solicit from various agency types candidates for membership. Those who volunteered or were "volunteered" are: Deb Hughes, Teresa Pierce, Doris Green, Ed Kamin, and Michael Van Dyke; DWS participants will be Nancy Buckwalter and Jude Morse. Nominees were requested by the February meeting. DWD hopes for 20 nominees willing to participate for 2 consecutive years and each member should assume s/he will lead at least one subcommittee.

The W-2 Co-chair will be elected by the membership; the BPS is the DWS Co-chair.

Members agreed the first point under "Non-member Participation in Committee Meetings" (W-2 agency directors and staff who are not members of the Committees, and other interested parties, may attend Committee meetings without participation as a member.") is not needed as the meetings are open.

A subcommittee should be made up of members with the skills and knowledge needed to resolve the issues for which it was created. Mr. Baker responded that this can be accomplished by not having only standing subcommittees but also groups formed for identified issues. Members suggested adding subcommittees for (1) Customer Satisfaction Survey (now exists), (2) Fiscal Issues (now exists), (3) Balance of State (new), (4) Contingency Fund (new), (5) Dispute Resolution (new). The subcommittee chairs, the number of members on the subcommittees, and the creation/termination of subcommittees are the responsibility of the Committee. Subcommittees can request DWS resources through the Bureau of Partner Services.

Mr. Baker said the C&I restructuring will be revised based on this discussion and the committee will move ahead.

Issue/Discussion: Customer Satisfaction Survey (Cheryl Cobb & Ron Blascoe)

Mr. Blascoe and Ms. Cobb provided an update of the workgroup's progress. The Dieringer Research Group has been hired to do the survey; they have worked with W-2 participants during earlier contacts. Work is progressing on the final version of the survey instrument; the group is attempting to word the queries specific to W-2 to avoid confusion with other services from the Job Centers. Phone calls are expected to begin about the second week of March to W-2 participants who entered W-2 since 01/01/2002. 50% of contacts will be by phone, with 30% by mail; there is no funding for personal, face-to-face contacts. The number of contacts will vary by agency size and contacts with the same participant will be limited to no more than 1 time every 6 months. A consortium will be treated as 1 agency. The agency "size" will be determined in February, using January data; "large" designations are not expected to change, but "small" and "medium" may see changes.

In response to member concerns with participants registering no satisfaction with the program because they didn't get cash payments, Mr. Blascoe noted that the survey is meant to determine satisfaction with services and the wording of the questions is aimed at overcoming that sort of bias.

The rating scale used to respond to questions remains under debate. Although a scale of 1-10 is the norm in survey research, some on the workgroup wish to use a 1-5 scale.

Ms. Cobb will forward a revised version of the draft instrument to members the week of January 21 for their review and comment.

Issue/Discussion: W-2 Cash Caseload (Eric Baker)

The biggest recent increase in cash caseload was in October, 2001. November and December also showed an increase, but at much smaller levels than October. The increases for November and December result from Milwaukee numbers; balance-of-state numbers actually went down.

Issue/Discussion: Update on Milwaukee W-2 Monitoring Committee (Mary Rowin)

Ms. Rowin reported information shared with the Monitoring Committee by Terry Ludeman. In Milwaukee, manufacturing positions continue to move to the suburbs; those jobs tend to respond to economic flux more quickly and deeply. Service jobs remain in the urban area; they tend toward more stability during market movements. In addition, many of the service jobs exist in employers running their own training programs (banking, insurance, data entry, etc.). This may produce a more stable City of Milwaukee workplace.

Issue/Discussion: OTHER –

None.

NEXT MEETING DATE: **March 15, 2002**
 10:00 AM
 201 East Washington Ave.
 GEF 1, Room D203
 Madison